DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 246 210 CE 039 191

AUTHOR Malveaux, Julianne
TITLE The Status of Women of Color in the Economy: The Legacy of Being Other.
PUB DATE Jun 84
NOTE 52p.; Paper presented at the National Conference on Women, the Economy, and Public Policy (Washington, DC, June 19-20, 1984). For other conference papers, see CE 039 189-192.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Historical Materials (060)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Asian Americans; Black Employment; Black Mothers; Blacks; Economic Status; *Employed Women; Employment Level; *Employment Patterns; Employment Practices; *Employment Problems; Females; Hispanic Americans; History; Labor Force; Labor Market; Living Standards; *Minority Groups; Needs Assessment; *Racial Discrimination; Salary Wage Differentials; *Sex Discrimination; Tables (Data); Trend Analysis

ABSTRACT

Black, Latina, and Asian women generally work in jobs that are less well-paying and lower on the occupational hierarchy than are the jobs held by their white counterparts. In addition, these women of color face higher unemployment rates than do white women. Whereas the entry of large numbers of white women into the work force is a fairly recent phenomenon, black women have had a high and steady rate of employment dating back to the 1800s. Hispanic women share many labor market similarities with black women. In the period from 1960 to 1980, the number of black private household workers began to decline as the proportion of black, female clerical workers increased; however, black women were still more heavily represented in blue-collar women's jobs than were white women. Like their black counterparts, Hispanic and Asian women tend to be overrepresented in certain low-paying, low-status jobs. Despite the fact that women of color generally receive substantially lower wages than do white women, more of them are likely to be employed full time and to be working for economic reasons than are white women. The wage gap that exists between white and nonwhite women has many implications for the family, a situation that must be addressed by policymakers. (Appended to this report are 11 tables detailing employment and wage patterns of white and minority group women.) (MN)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED246210

LE

THE STATUS OF WOMEN OF COLOR IN THE ECONOMY: THE LEGACY OF BEING OTHER

WRITTEN BY
DR. JULIANNE MALVEAUX
SAN FRANCISCO STATE UNIVERSITY
JUNE, 1984
FOR THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON
WOMEN, ECONOMY, AND PUBLIC POLICY
JUNE 19-20, 1984

CE039191

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

✓ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R Jordan

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Black, Latina, and Asian women are "other" in the labor market in the same way as their men are. They are "other" because their occupational characteristics differ considerably from the occupational characteristics of white women. Women of color work in jobs that are less well paying than jobs that white women hold, and in jobs that are lower on an occupational hierarchy.

Women of color face higher unemployment rates than do white women. In May, 1984, on a non-seasonally adjusted basis, the unemployment rate for white women was 5.6%, compared to 13.2% for black women and 9.4% for Hispanic women. In addition, more women of color work because they must -- because they head households more frequently than do white women, and because men of color experience higher unemployment rates and lower wages than do white men. The work effort of women of color is often key in the survival of families of color.

The purpose of this paper is to discuss the historical status of women of color. Census and labor force data provide the basis for most of this discussion. There is comprehensive historical data on "nonwhite" women. Most of these women are black. Those Hispanic (Mexican, Cuban or Asian) women who are designated as non-white are included in historical data, and we can track the unemployment and occupational status of Hispanic women after 1976. There is little detailed occupational or employment data on Asian women.

With historical data as a base, this paper further discusses the current occupational and wage status of women of color, and ways low occupational and wage status frequently leads to poverty. The future prospects of women of color in the labor market are also discussed.

THE HISTORICAL STATUS OF BLACK WOMEN

The most significant aspect of the black woman's participation in the economy is her high and steady labor force participation. As early as 1890, nearly two in five black women and girls over the age of ten were employed, and one in five girls, between ten and fourteen years of age, held jobs. In the same year one in eight white women and girls were employed. Historically, employment levels differed significantly between black and white women.

Employment patterns differed significantly as well. Black women had high labor force participation rates, whether married or single, and with or without children. The level of black female employment varied little by age except for black women over age sixty-five, and even after age 65, one in four black women worked. In contrast, white female employment dropped steadily with age, so that fewer than one in ten white women over age 65 worked. If the age patterns of marriage and childbearing are taken into consideration, one might posit that white women exchanged the role of worker for the role of wife and mother, while black women added the responsibility as wife and mother to their role as worker. (Malveaux, 1981)

Few historical facts have changed in the labor force participation of black women. Participation, always high, has increased from 46% in 1950 to 49.5% in 1967, to 53% in 1978, to 58% in May, 1984. Increased participation has been most pronounced among black women between ages 25 and 44; more than 70% of the black women in that age group were labor force participants in 1983. (U.S. Department of Labor, 1983)

Hispanic women share some labor market similarities to black women. While their labor force participation rates are not as high as those of black or white women, they are comparable to the participation rates of white women (on a non-seasonally adjusted basis 45.2% in May, 1984, compared to 57.6% for black women and 53.5% for white women). Mirande and Enriquez (1979) note that the level of Hispanic female labor force participation may be understated because of their employment in transient occupations like domestic service, and because some Hispanic women are in the United States illegally.

High rates of black female labor force participation, and significant rates of Hispanic female participation are partly a function of the fact that the jobs and pay available to men of color are so low that the wages of women of color are needed for family survival. Historically, this has been true because men of color, and black men in particular, have been concentrated in low-paying non-craft blue collar jobs. Presently, though the occupational status of black men has improved, levels of adult black male jobholding are lower than those of white men. The employment population ratio (or the percentage of black men who hold jobs) at 64.3% in May, 1984 is ten percentage points lower than the employment population ratio of white men. The reason for the difference is the fact that fewer black man participate in the labor market than white men (many do not participate because they are discouraged workers), and because black men experience significantly higher unemployment rates than do white men. (Black male unemployment rates are usually twice those of white men; recently they have been more than twice white rates: 14.1% as opposed to 5.6% in May, 1984). (U.S. Department

of Labor, May, 1984)

The employment population ratios of Hispanic men have been higher than those of black or white men -- in May, 1984 on a non-seasonally adjusted basis, 76.6% of Hispanic men held jobs, compared to 74.4% of white men and 64.3% of black men. Though Hispanic men held jobs similar to those of black men, they have usually had lower unemployment rates and higher rates of labor force participation.

When men have not been able to earn adequate incomes, their wives have had high labor force participation rates. However, from an historical perspective, women of color faced limited employment opportunities. The earliest year for which data is available is 1890, when fifty-two percent of all black women worked in domestic and personal service occupations, and another 44% on farms. Only 4% of all black women worked in non-farm, non-service jobs. (Malveaux, 1981)

By 1930, there had been some decline in the number of farm workers, but that was accompanied by an increase in the proportion of black women that worked in domestic and personal service occupations. In 1930 nearly two in three black women worked in domestic and personal service, with just ten percent working in non-farm, non-service jobs. By 1940, mainly because of movement out of agriculture, seventy percent of all black women worked in domestic and personal service jobs, with sixty percent working in private homes. Just sixteen percent of black women remained in agriculture, with the remaining fourteen percent employed in manufacturing and professional jobs.

In contrast to the jobs black women held, white women worked

in manufacturing, as sales and clerical workers, and as teachers, nurses and other professional workers. In 1940, when seventy percent of black women worked in domestic and personal service jobs, fewer than a quarter of all white women held in such jobs. On the other hand, in the same year, just six percent of black women worked as white collar workers, with most working as schoolteachers. More than half of the white women who worked held white collar jobs.

Black women's historical overrepresentation in private household work is part of the slave legacy of black women. The fact that black women were overrepresented in the private household job had apparent negative effects on the economic status of black women, since this job was the poorest paying of any occupation. Working conditions for private household workers was also poor, as the most striking feature of such work has been it casual nature.

This pattern of differences between black and white women in the labor market has blurred somewhat; but clear differences in the occupational status of black and white women have persisted through the present, a clear legacy of the strict occupational segregation measured as recently as 1940.

Between 1940 and 1960, the occupational status of black women improved significantly. Black women began their exodus from private household work (this trend continues as older black private household workers leave the labor force and a negligible number of young labor market entrants work in that occupation), by increasing their participation in professional jobs, and by moving slowly into clerical work, and light manufacturing. By 1960, just a third of the black women in he labor market worked at private household jobs. By 1980, just 6% of black women worked as private household workers.

The occupational movement between 1940 and 1960 is shown in Table One.

The changes in black women's occupational status that took place between 1940 and 1960 can be attributed to several factors. Firstly, changes in technology generated substitution of black female private household workers for black female service workers. Secondly, the increase in light manufacturing jobs during this period was important in explaining increases in the number of black female blue-collar workers. Finally, though the number of black women holding clerical jobs was low in 1960, the increase in the number of black female clerical workers that took place between 1940 and 1960 was an early indication of the massive increase in the number of black female clerical workers that would take place in the next decade.

OCCUPATIONAL CHANGE AMONG BLACK WOMEN 1960-1981

In the 1960-1980 period, black women experienced a significant amount of occupational change. The trends that began in the 1940-1960 period continued through this period, so that the key changes during this period included a decline in the proportion of black female private household workers and an increase in the proportion of black female clerical workers. There has also been slow penetration of black women into managerial and other traditionally male jobs. Although black and white women held very dissimilar jobs in 1940, when most black women worked as private household workers and most white women worked as white collar workers, distinctions between the two groups of women blurred by 1980. Still, black women

were more heavily represented in "blue collar" women's jobs than were white women.

What do we mean my "women's jobs" or "typically female" jobs? "Typically female" jobs are those in which women are represented in excess of their proportion in the labor market. The number of women working in "typically female" jobs is so large that the occupational structure is quite stratified by gender. It is possible to designate most jobs as either "typically male" or "typically female", with fewer than sixteen percent of all Bureau of Labor Statistics-designated occupations as "neutral", or non sex-stratified, jobs (Malveaux, 1982). Definitions of occupational segegation vary -- Jusenius (1976) defines jobs as "typically female" if the proportion of women represented in such jobs was greater than five percent more than the proportion of women in the workplace. (In other words, if women are 43% of the labor force, then jobs that are more than 48% female are considered segregated). Others would define female-stratified occupations as those where women have a high (seventy to eighty percent) representation. The definitions are hardly worth quibbling over, since occupational polarization emerges clearly from the data; in 1981, nearly fifty percent of all women worked in just fifty-three occupations (of 429) that were more than eighty percent female, while nearly sixty-five percent of all men worked in some two hundred eleven occupations that were more than eighty percent male. (Malveaux, 1982).

From a broad occupational perspective, it is possible to target certain jobs as "typically female" jobs. These include clerical and (most) service jobs, non-college teaching, nursing, retail sales work, and some light manufacturing. It is significant

to note that from a detailed occupational perspective, black women tend to be overrepresented in a set of jobs in which they awere unrepresented just two decades ago. For example, while black women are just 5.4% of the labor force, they represent almost eighteen percent of the file clerks, twenty percent of the clerical assistants, sixteen percent of the typists, and sixteen percent of the telephone operators. In many cases, the jobs in which black women are overrepresented are the lowest paying jobs in an occupational category.

Between 1960 and 1980, black women improved their occupational status largely by moving from one set of "typically female" occupations to another set of "typically female" set of occupations. A third of all black women worked as private household workers in 1960, and just nine percent of black women worked as clerical and sales workers. But by 1977, only eight percent worked as priveate household workers; nearly thirty percent worked as clerical and sale workers.

Table Two shows the percentage of women in typically female jobs in 1968, 1977, and 1981. It illustrates the fact that the proportion of black women in "typically female" jobs has remained relatively constant after 1977. However, the types of "typically female" job held by black women changed somewhat between 1968 and 1981. In 1968 most black women worked in "blue collar" typically female jobs, as nondurable goods manufacturers, service workers, and private household workers. By 1981, most worked in "white collar2 typically female jobs -- clerical workers, retail sales workers, health professionals and noncollege teachers.

Table Three shows the occupational distribution of black

women in 1977 and 1981. Comparing this table to Tables One and Two gives of picture of the occupational change that black women experienced between 1960 and 1981. The most significant changes included the following:

(1) Black women moved out of private household work. In 1960, more than one in three black working women was employed as a private household worker. By 1981, just six percent of all black working women were so employed. The proportion of black women working in private household jobs increases with age (after age 20), as shown in Table Four, suggesting that older black women may be more locked in to these low paying jobs than are other black women. One in five black women between ages 55 and 64 work as private household workers, as do two of five black women over 65 who report that they are working. Significantly, three quarters of the 317,000 black women private household workers were over age 45 in 1981.

(2) Black women moved into clerical work. In 1960, just eight percent of employed black women worked in clerical jobs. By 1970, this number increased to 19.4%, and by 1981, 29.5% of employed black women worked in clerical jobs. The increase in the proportion of black female clerical workers can be partly attributed to an increase in the number of clerical jobs in the economy. Between 1968 and 1981 total employment rose by 38%, while clerical employment rose by 51%. Since the clerical proportion of white women has declined while the number of job openings has increased there have been more opportunities in this occupation for black women.

Sixty-five percent of the black women in clerical jobs are 34 years old or younger (compared to fifty-two percent of the white

women), indicating the recent entry of black women into these jobs. While more than a quarter of white clerical workers are above age 45, fewer than 15% of black clerical workers are 45 or older. The differences in the age distributions of black and white clerical workers indicates that young black women find clerical work a far more desirable job than do young white women. Older white women may experience a "lock-in" similar to the "lock-in" older black private household workrs experience, but young black women seem to be seeking the work that young white women are fleeing.

(3) Black women maintained singificant representation in service work.

In 1960, 21% of employed black women worked in service jobs (except private household work). The number had increased to 25% by 1968 and rose slightly above that, to 26.7% in 1977. By 1981, black women continued to be heavily represented among service workers, though the proportion of black women holding service jobs dropped somewhat, to 23.7%.

Most black female service workers over age 24 work as health service workers. These jobs include dental assistants, health aides, nursing aides, orderlies, attendants and practical nurses. The next largest concentration of black women in service jobs is among food service workers. The proportion of black women in this occupation has increased slightly, from just under 5% in 1968 to 6.8% in 1981. While there are numerically more black women aged 25-54 working in food service jobs (nearly sixty percent of black female food service workers are in these age groups), this job category employes a significant number of young (16-24 year old) black women. In fact, by 1981, nearly one in five 16-19 year old black women worked in food

serivce jobs.

A significant number of black women, especially those over 45, work in cleaning services. The increase in the representation of black women among cleaning service workers stems directly from the decline in the representation of black women private household workers. These black women are working in jobs that have more regular working conditions than the private household jobs they vacated.

(4) It is important to note that by 1981 sixty percent of all black women were represented in the clerical, service, or private household occupations.

(5) Black women increased their representation as retail sales workers.

Black women were virtually unrepresented as sales workers in 1960. By 1981, black women were more than three percent of all sales workers. The few (less than 170,000) black women who work in this occupation, however, tend to be retail sales workers.

(6) One in seven black women worked as manufacturing operatives.

The proportion of black women working as operatives has been declining since 1968, when 17.5% of working black women held such jobs. Part of the decline has to do with the decline in manufacturing jobs, part has to do with international competition in the textile industry, and part has to do with the different opportunities available to black women. By 1981, 14.5% of working black women worked as operatives, with more than half working as nondurable goods operatives, the jobs in that occupation that had the lowest rates of pay. These workers included textile workers, sewers

and stitchers, packers, and laundry workers.

(7) Black women increased their representation in "typically female" health professions and maintained their representation in other "typically female" professional jobs like non-college teaching.

Table Three shows an increase in the number of black female professional workers between 1977 and 1981, a trend that began in 1960 when just 7% of black women held professional jobs. By 1968, the number rose to 9.5%, and by 1981, 15.4% of black women held professional jobs. The proportion of noncollege teachers remained constant between 1968 and 1981 at 4.7%, despite the fact that the number of noncollege teachers declined slightly during those years. But proportion of black women health professionals more than douled between 1977 and 1981.

(8) Black women began to enter "traditionally male" professional, managerial, and crafts jobs where they were previously unrepresented.

There was a ten percent increase in the number of black female professional workers, and a nearly thirty percent increase in the number of black female managers between 1960 and 1981. Still, fewer than 20% of all black women worked in these occupations. Despite an increase in the number of black female profesionals, fewer than two percent of all attorneys are black women, as are fewer than three percent of all physicians, scientists, computer specialists or architects. As part of the slow penetration of black women into "traditionally male" jobs, it is significant to note that though just 1.5% of all black women hold crafts jobs, this is an area were black wome were unrepresented in 1960.

(9) Some individual black women improved their status between 1968 and 1977 perhaps as a result of affirmative action hiring. Table Seven shows this: improvement in the status of black women over 25 who have already chosen occupations was interpreted as the result of some force that caused these women to change their occupational status. Women who were 25-34 in 1968 had improved their status somewhat by 1977 because they decreased their representation among clerical workers and private household workers, while increasing their representaion as professionals and managers. Likewise, black women who were 35-44 in 1968 moved into the health professions and into managerial occupations, while out of private household work. Older women showed no change in their occupational status.

BLACK WOMEN'S CROWDING

While Table Two shows black women at work in "typically female" jobs, the employment patterns of women of color often differ from the employment patterns of white women. When broad occupational categories are used, the key difference between white women and women of color is the fact that black women are more frequently employed in blue collar "typically female" jobs.

From a broad occupational perspective, it is possible to target certain jobs as "typically female" jobs. These include clerical and (most) service jobs, non-college teaching, nursing, retail sales work, and some light manufacturing. It is significant to note that from a detailed occupational perspective, black women tend to be overrepresented in a set of jobs in which they awere

unrepresented just two decades ago. For example, while black women are just 5.4% of the labor force, they represent almost eighteen percent of the file clerks, twenty percent of the clerical assistants, sixteen percent of the typists, and sixteen percent of the telephone operators. In many cases, the jobs in which black women are overrepresented are the lowest paying jobs in an occupational category.

The pattern of black women's crowding is not restricted to the clerical labor market. Similar overrepresentation exists in the professional occupations, where black women are disproportionately dietitians, prekindergarten teachers, registered nurses and social workers; in service jobs, where black women are twenty percent of the health service workers, and more than sixteen percent of the health service aides. The pattern further persists among operatives, with black women overrepresented as laundry and dry cleaning operatives, sewers and stitchers, pressers, sorters, and assemblers. In fact, black female enclaves can be found most of the broad occupational groups where tradiionally female jobs exist, except in the managerial and sales categories.

This phenomena of "black women's crowding" is important because it illustrates how mixed the occupational progress of black women has been. Black women left one set of jobs, which they dominated, to enter other jobs. In some cases they now dominate the least desirable jobs in certain occupational groups. The development of black women's occupational "ghettoes" illustrates the restricted occupational opportunities that many black women face.

THE OCCUPATIONAL STATUS OF HISPANIC WOMEN

There are many similarities between the occupational status

of black women and the occupaional status of Hispanic women. Like black women, Hispanic women have had significant (though lower than black or white) levels of labor force participation. Hispanic women also have similar labor force patterns as black women in that they tend to be concentrated in blue collar and service jobs instead of white collar jobs. But between 1977 and 1981, Hispanic women increased their representation in "typically female" white collar jobs, mostly in clerical jobs, while reducing representation in crowded blue collar jobs.

There were differences in the blue collar jobs held by black and Hispanic women. Proportionately more Hispanic women were found both in durable and nondurable goods operative occupations than were either black or white women. In 1981, almost twenty percent of all Hispanic women worked as operatives. Fewer Hispanic women worked in service jobs than did black women. There were proportionately fewer Hispanic women, particularly, in health service occupations.

Production operatives in the semi-conductor (computer) industry are predominately female. According to reseachers who have focused on this industry (Friaz, 1983) 40-50% of these workers tend to be minority, with the type of minority woman varying by the location of a plant. Thus, hi-tech firms in the South will disproportionately hire black women, while those in California and near the Mexican border will disproportionately hire Hispanic women.

If hi-tech firms attempt to stablilize the skilled labor force in the face of fluctuating demand for their products, it is likely that they use subcontracting, temporary work (ie "job shops"), and other arrangments to secure temporary labor. Though only sketchy

data exist, such a trend is likely to place many minority women in positions of salary and job insecurity.

Table Five also shows that Hispanic women differed from other women in terms of the white collar jobs they held. While represented at a comparable level to other women in clerical jobs, only one in twelve Hispanic women holds a professional, technical, or related job. Hispanic women are also underrepresented in "typically female" professional jobs, including health professionals and non-college teachers.

Data on Hispanic women is less available than data on black women. Because of questions of statistical reliability, the Bureau of Labor Statistics does not report detailed occupation for Hispanic women, nor do they report two-digit occupation by age. Further, the term "Hispanic" is used to aggregate three distinct populations of workers: Mexican, Puerto Rican, and Cuban workers. Three-quarters of all Hispanic workers are Mexican-American. It is likely that the occupational and employment patterns of these very diverse nationalities is somewhat different.

Table Six shows the occupational distribution for white, black, Hispanic, and Mexican women. It indicates that Mexican women are slightly less well represented than are other Hispanic women in white collar occupations, and slightly more heavily represented in blue collar occupations, except private household work. Though the percentage differences represented are slight, the trend potentially represented is consistent with the fact that Chicana (or Mexican-Americans) have less education than do other Hispanic women (Mirande and Enriquez, 1979). A further factor in the occupational profile of Chicana women is the job tracking that guidance counselors

and others provide to these women. Researchers on the educational status of Chicanas found, in 1973, that:

> The Chicana's opportunities are limited to one uniform or another. Cleaning bed pans, doing the laundry, ironing, and housecleaning are not new jobs for te Chicana. What has changed is that she may be aole to charge more money per shirt and there are more people who will hire her in uniform. These educators do not see a need to increase the opportunities of the poor woman. Unfortunately, when institutions begin to open their doors to women, it is not a victory for all women, but for women of a specific economic class. (Nieto-Gomez, 1973)

OCCUPATIONAL STATUS OF OTHER WOMEN OF COLOR

Though data on women of color who are not black or Hispanic is scarce, some of the patterns observed for black and Hispanic women carry over to other women of color. Especially among black women, we have been able to show the development of "typically black female" jobs where black women are overrepresented. This is true of Hispanic women, especially as operatives, and of Asian women, especially as workers in textile industries.

Miranda and Enriquez note that occupational and employment patterns of Chicana women may be affected by the fact that many may lack English skills and also may be in United States without documentation. This pattern is one that Hispanic women may share with Asian women. As a result, it is likely that data on Hispanic and Asian women are estimates, since some of these women may work in the underground economy as service workers and in light manufacturing.

The labor force participation rates of Asian women have been estimated as lower than those of black or Hispanic women. These estimates may understate the level of participation among Asian women,

especially since many are unpaid workers in family-owned small businesses.

There is much more to learn about the occupational status of women of color, especially of Asian and American Indian women. If what we know about black and Hispanic women is any indication, however, we can expect these women to be found in blue collar "typically female" jobs.

OCCUPATION AND PAY

The concentration of women of color in certain "typically female" jobs is important when the types of jobs these women are concentrated in are examined. The discussion has asserted that those clerical and service jobs in which women, especially black and Latin women, are concentrated are the least well paying and least desirable of jobs in the occupational strata. Table Twelve, which shows selected characteristics of occupations, seeks to make this point more clearly. While the occupational categories differ somewhat from categories used in earlier tables, notes that accompany the table facilitate comparison.

The first column of Table Seven shows unemployment rates in August, 1983, by occupation. Of white collar workers, clerical and sales workers fare least well with unemployment rates at nearly double those of white collar workers. Among other workers, manufacturing workers (ie operators) have the highest unemployment rates, though machine equipment operators have lower rates than handlers, who are more likely to be women. Service workers also have higher than average unemployment.

The unemployment data show that clerical occupations, which are typically female, have unemployment rates lower than those of craft and manufacturing occupations, which are typically male. These differences are a function of some of the structural changes that are occuring in the economy, especially the relative decline in the manufacturing sector. But the relevant comparison may not be between white collar, clerical and sales workers and blue collar, manufacturing workers, but between white collar clerical and sales workers and other white collar workers. When median pay is compared, clerical and sales workers earn significantly less than other white collar workers.

A second occupational characteristic is the full or part time status of workers. The second column of Table Seven shows part time status of workers by occupation. An average of 18% of all workers work part time. The largest proportion of part time workers may be found in the service occupations, except protective service work, among operatives classified as handlers, and among retail sales workers. While women are more likely than men to work part time in every job category, the occupations categories mentioned also represented the greatest number of part time women.

A third occupational characteristic is whether part time work effort is economic. The third column of Table Seven shows this. (It may be useful to note that the level of voluntary part time work is the difference between the total percentage of part time workers and the percentage of economic part time workers). Again, the largest number of economic part time workers are service workers. The next largest concentrations are laborers, sales workers, and operatives.

Most women who work part time do so because they want to, or

because thier circumstances force them into "choosing" part-time work. But a third of the women who work part time do so for economic reasons. Table Eight highlights occupational differences between those women who work part time voluntarily and those who work part time for economic reasons.

Those women who work part time voluntarily have a somewhat better occupational profile than those women who work part time for economic reasons. In particular, voluntary part time workers are more heavily represented in professional and managerial jobs, and in clerical and administrative support jobs. The majority of women who work part time for economic reasons are concentrated in service and light manufacturing jobs. A comparison of part time workers yields the conclusion that those women who work part time because they cannot find full time work are concentrated in those jobs where women are heavily represented, but in the least desirable of these jobs.

There are differences in the level of work effort between black and white women. Black women are more likely to work full time than are white women, and when black women work part time, they are more likely to work part time for economic reasons than are white women. Nearly twice the proportion of white women work part time voluntarily as do black women. (Malveaux, 1984)

Black women's work effort exceeds that of white women at every educational level. The full-time work effort of both black and white women rises with the amount of education; the gap in full time work effort is narrowest between black and white women with postgraduate educations. (Malveaux, 1984)

Table Seven provides further evidence that service and clerical jobs should be considered low-wage jobs. The last columns of

the table show median pay for full time workers by occupation. Using full-time pay standardizes earnings comparisons somewhat, since more women than men work part time and since black and white women have different levels of work effort. However, using median full-time pay is flawed if the wage distribution of black and whie women differs by occupation. In other words, if black women in an occupation tend to be paid less than white women, use of median weekly pay data understates wage differences between black and white women. The oft-discussed wage gap is illustrated in the last columns of Table 12, as the average full-time woman earned about two-thirds of what full-time men earned in 1983. The wage ratio ranged from 53% for sales workers to a high of 87% for light manufacturers (handlers).

Those women who were paid least for their full-time work effort included service workers (especially private household workers), sales workers, operators, and clerical workers. Median weekly pay should be considered by noting that the poverty level in 1982 was $9862, or full-time, full-year weekly pay of $190. The average female service worker who worked full time, full year had earnings that put her below the poverty line. Those service workers (more than a third) who worked part time earned well below poverty level earnings. Service workers have one chance in ten of experiencing unemployment, thereby lowering average annual wages. The concentration of women of color in service jobs, then, is cause for concern.

Workers who earn 125 percent of the poverty level are considered "working poor". Their earnings exempt them from poverty, but only marginally. These workers earned $12,328 or less in 1982, or for full-time, full-year workers, to about $237 per week. Women with

earnings below this weekly level, including full-time sales, machine operators and handlers, could be classified as working poor.

There are flaws in developing conclusions about the wage status of women in occupations based on median weekly earnings. Median weekly earnings, though representative of occupational earnings, say little about the distribution of earnings. While it can be concluded that half the women in an occupation earn a wage below the median and half earn a wage above the median, nothing can be said about the number of women who are clustered near the median wage which may be important when the issue of "working poor" is discussed. Further, median weekly earnings are reported for full time workers. The fact that so many women work part time for economic reasons (as shown in Table 7) suggests that if these wage medians are used to measure the proportion of women in an occupation that earn low wages, they will understate that proportion. Despite flaws in the use of median weekly earnings data, the aggregate patterns these data yield are useful in focusing on the occupations in which women are likely to earn low wages.

LOW-WAGE STATUS OF BLACK WOMEN BY DETAILED OCCUPATION

At the level reported in Table Six, the occupational status of black and white women is similar, with key differences being differences in the proportion of black women employed in "typically female" blue collar jobs like service and light manufacturing jobs. However, when detailed job data is examined, it becomes clear that there are key differences between the types of jobs that black and white women hold (detailed data is not available for Hispanic women). In general, black women hold the lowest-paying jobs in each occupational category.

The service occupation is a good example. Table Nine ranks service jobs by the percentage of black women found in each of those jobs. The percentage of white women in each job category, and male and female median pay are also shown. The data shown in Table Sixteen are for 1981, since 1983 detailed occupational information are not available. It should be noted that the 1981 poverty line was approximately $9300, or a weekly wage of about $180. One hundred twenty five percent of the 1981 poverty line was $11,625; the corresponding weekly wage was $223.

While black women are but 5.4% of the total labor market, and 10.3% of service workers (thus, exhibiting some patterns of black female crowding at the aggregate level) black women are overrepresented by a factor of more than four as chambermaids, welfare service aides, and nursing aides. In fact, fully a quarter of ALL nursing aides were black women in 1981, and more than five percent of all working black women were employed in those three occupations where pay was below, or near, the 1981 poverty line.

Another significant number of black women (where overrepresentation is by a factor of more than three), are represented as practical nurses, cleaning women, health aides, and boarders and keepers. Half of all black service women work in jobs where black women are overrepresented by a factor of four or more, and for wages that are 125% below poverty wages.

Black women are also overrepresented among child care workers, whose full time wages place them below the poverty line, food counter workers, who earn similarly low wages, cooks, whose wages are also below the poverty line, and hairdressers. In fact, 83.3% of all black women in service jobs worked in jobs defined as "typically black female" in earlier work by this writer (1984).

Table Nine is useful in highlighting differences between black and white women's occupational patterns. For example, while white women are overrepresented as dental assistants, black women are just proportionately represented in this occupation. Full time pay for dental assistants is higher than that of nursing aids, a job where black women are heavily overrepresented. It is interesting to speculate on differences in institutional arrangements in the two occupations that result in such a difference. Similarly, black women are just proportionately represented as waiters, while white women are heavily overrepresented in this occupation. While pay in the food service industry is low, there are reasons this job may be attractive to black women. Again, questions of discrimination and entry barriers should be considered.

Average full-time pay for female service workers, at $170 per week, indicates that most women in these occupations earns less than a poverty wage. Table Nine shows that 72.3% of black service women

worked in jobs where meedian weekly pay was less than the $170 weekly average for service workers, compared to 69% of white service women. The differences between the concentrations of black and white women is that black women are both more likely to work in "traditionally black female" jobs and are more likely to work at these jobs part time for economic reasons.

Clerical work employs both the largest number and the largest proportion of black and white women. Data in this occupation show a mixed pattern. The median 1981 wage of $219 places the average clerical worker out of poverty, but in the near poor category. Yet, the range of clerical pay is broad: postal clerks have median earnings of $382 per week, or almost $20,000 per year, while cashiers have median weekly pay of $133 per week, or less than $7000 per year. Interestingly, both of these occupations are "typically black female" jobs.

The detailed clerical occupations are arranged by the percentage of black women in Table Ten. This detail illustrates those clerical enclaves that have become "typically black female". Nearly a quarter of all black women are concentrated in just six of forty-eight clerical occupations. They are overrepresented by a factor of four as file clerks, typists, keypunch operators, teaching assistants, calculating machine operators, and social welfare clerical assistants. Except for the median wage of social welfare clerical assistants, all of these occupations have median wages associated with the near-poor. Thus, those occupations that employ most clerical black women have pay levels at 125% of the poverty level, or lower. (Eleven precent of white clerical workers are employed in these occupations).

It is important to note that nearly a third of black clerical

women were employed by government. (Malveaux, 1984). It is likely that other women of color are also heavily represented as public sector employees. Thus, for many black women, the fiscal health of federal, state and local governments affects wage levels. Further, layoffs of government workers may have a greater impact on black women clericals than on others both because of their heavy representation among government employees and because of the fact that many of these black women workers are recently hired municipal employees.

Patterns found in clerical and service occupations are also evident in operative, sales, and laborer occupations. (Malveaux, 1984) In general, black women are less well-paid than are white women, their patterns of employment are different, and there is some black women's "crowding" when detailed occupations are viewed. Different patterns are also found between professional and managerial black women and comparable white women. Professional and managerial black women are also more heavily represented in "typically female" health professions and non-college teaching jobs than are white women.

IMPLICATIONS OF THE LOW-WAGE STATUS OF WOMEN OF COLOR

The previous sections have outlined the occupations in which women of color work, and the earnings implications of their presence in those occupations. From these data, it is possible to estimate that more than 61% becomes of all black women are employed in jobs where median weekly full-time earnings place them at the poverty or near-poverty level. Although the method of estimation is different for Hispanic women, Table Eleven shows that slightly more Hispanic than black women are either poor or near-poor. Because the number of

black and Hispanic women who work part time for economic reasons is high, this estimate is likely to be a low estimate of the number of working women in or near poverty.

A number of demographic factors combine with these earnings data to suggest that there are important present and future implications of the current low-wage status of women of color. The low wages of women of color are especially important because so many of these women head households. Forty-two percent of all black families, twenty-three percent of all Hispanic families, and twelve percent of all white families are female-headed. But female-headed families exprience proportionately more poverty than do other families: 70% of the black families in poverty are headed by black women; nearly half of the Hispanic families in poverty are headed by Hispanic women; and more than a third of the white families in poverty are headed by white women.

Women of color who head families have primary responsibility for children of color, so the earnings potential of these women affects the life chances of their children. In 1982, for example, the majority of black children lived in families with incomes below the poverty level. Two-thirds of the children in families headed by black women were in poverty. Similarly, nearly half of all Hispanic children lived in families with incomes below the poverty level, and 64% of those in families headed by women were in poverty. (US Department Of Commerce, 1983)

The incidence of poverty among households headed byyoung women of color is especially alarming. Four in five families headed by black women between 15 and 24 are in poverty. While detailed data are not available for Hispanic women of the same age, the level is

comparable. These teen women of color are vocationally unprepared to support a child, and will either earn low wages or become dependent on public assistance. In the long run, the children of these young women will have a more limited set of life chances and less assess to health, education, and housing than will other children. (The computer revolution may create "haves" and "have nots" in the information category. The December decision by the Federal Communications Commission not to regulate children's programming because parents can subscribe to cable channels further makes it clear how parent's income can advantage some children.)

Families headed by women of color older than 24 experience poverty that is somewhat like, though not as extreme, as that of young women of color. Most black families headed by women of color between 25 and 34 are in poverty. Poverty incidence increases with the number of children in a family. Educational attainment does not shelter women of color who head household from poverty, since more than half of black women high school graduates who head families are in poverty, as are more than third of the Hispanic women who are high school graduates.

Those children raised in families headed by women of color will grow up with fewer resources than other families. This fact is exacerbated by the high unemployment and decreased labor force participation of very young black and Hispanic women. The barriers that prevent young black women from entering the labor force affect them, and also affect their children. For many black women, dependence and AFDC status is an alternative to a labor market they find difficult to enter. The fact that the average AFDC recipient recieves benefits for 22 months suggests a relationship between

dependency and low-wage work. This writer would hypothesize that the jobs that AFDC women hold when they work are jobs with low pay, few benefits, and no "cushions" to protect from emergencies. Thus, AFDC provides the "cushion" or support when women cannot work (because, for example, a child is ill, transportation arrangements fall through, or other calamities occur). A view of low-wage women of olor must include the recognition that these women frequently move between work and public assistance because their jobs provide inadeuqate wages, low benefits, and poor work arrangements.

Forty-two percent of older (65 plus) black women have incomes below the poverty level. This is understandable when the types of jobs they held in their worklives are examined. The fact that so many women of color continue to work in jobs with wages at or near poverty suggests that their economic status when they are elderly will be similar to that of current elderly black women. In other words, older women of color who are now poor have been poor all of their lives. Their poverty status is not a function of marital disruption, but of the low-paying jobs with high unemployment rates and high turnover they held all their lives. (Jackson, 1983)

Many women of color who are now in the labor force are also likely to be poor when they are old. The fact that many of these women tend to work part time, or to hold jobs where turnover is high suggests they have not been protected from old-age poverty by pension contributions or through savings. The trend of elderly black female poverty will be slowed or halted only when the occupational status or the earnings status of younger black women changes.

Despite some indication that computers will provide job opportunities in our economy, those jobs currently predicted for

maximum growth in the next few years are clerical and health service jobs (Dicesare, 1975). The likelihood of low wages for clerical workers has already been mentioned. To the extent that black women have tended to hold the least skilled, least well-paying clerical jobs, growth in that occupational area may provide black women with more jobs, but not with better quality jobs. Although data are not currently available, it would be interesting to measure the representation of women of color in higher skilled, higher paying word processing jobs.

Even if women of color move into these better skilled jobs, the occupational health hazards that accompany these jobs are of concern, especially to the extent that these black women are household heads and interact with their children. A preliminary survey by 9 to 5 sampled almost 1000 ESSENCE Magazine readers; this survey showed that a significant number (20%) of the black women respondents reported work-related eyestrain more than twice a week. More frequently reported health effects of the workplace included exhaustion (39% of those sampled), and muscle strain (33%). (9 to 5, 1983)

Growth in the health services, where many black women work as either nurses, nurses' aides, or hospital assistants, may again provide jobs for black women, but under a set of working conditions that are not necessarily positive. Institutional arrangements in the hospital industry are changing, so that jobs previously held by city employees are now held by the same workers are paid by private corporations who manage or own hospitals. The shift in employee sometimes means a pay cut for workers. (Klienfiled, 1983)

The current occupational status of women of color has negative

implications for the long run economic status of these women and their children. Young clerical workers and older service workers earn relatively low wages, experience high turnover, and relatively high unemployment. When these women head families, both they and their children are disadvantaged by their low earnings. No occupational or industrial trends suggest that the number of women of color who experience poverty will lessen. In fact, the rapid increase of black women into clerical jobs suggests persistence (if not growth) in the amount of poverty that black women will experience the amount of poverty their children will experence. It is further important to note that the decline in black male employment population ratios, and the low wage status of Hispanic men further impacts the survival of families of color since both female headed households and households with two adults may be forced to depend on the earnings of a woman of color, which are likely to be low.

CONCLUSIONS

Women of color have consistently contributed to the economy in the form of their labor force effort. Though their role has been constrained by barriers of racism and sexism, there is evidence that some of the barriers women of color have faced in the past are now weakening. At the same time, future labor demand trends suggest that women of color will remain "other" occupationally for the forseeable future.

The effects of the status as "other" that women of color experience, poverty among these women and their families is high. There have been efforts on the part of policy makers to ameliorate

this poverty through a variety of social programs. Some of these programs have been successful -- the level of black poverty dropped from 50% to 27% between 1960 and 1977. However, poverty has risen among minorities since 1977. By 1983, more than a third of all black families and 27% of all Hispanic families had incomes below the poverty line. The increase in the level of poverty in recent years shows that public policy can play a major role in improving the status of women of color and their families.

In fact, the future employment and occupational status of women of color is partly dependent on the economic climate and also partly dependent on the design of social and economic programs to assist these women. The unemployment rates of both black and Hispanic women dropped somewhat during the recent economic "recovery", but their continued presence in low-paying "typically female" jobs has not improved the wage picture. The challenge to policy-makers is to develop programs that can improve the wage status of these women.

In 1984, like 1890, the contribution of women of color to the economy is consistent, and high. It is limited only by the legacy of historical discrimination and by their gender, which locks them into the least well paying "typically female" jobs. A change in the economic climate as well as a creative approach to improving the occupational status of women of color are necessary to maximize the contribution of young women of color who are entering the labor market.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE ONE

OCCUPATION OF EMPLOYED WOMEN 14 YEARS OLD AND OVER: 1940, 1960, AND 1970

	Black			White		
	1940	1960	1970	1940	1960	1970
Total employed.....thousands.....	1,542	2,455	3,329	9,564	18,549	25,471
Percent.....	100	100	100	100	100	100
White-collar workers.....	6	17	32	52	59	61
Professional, technical, and kindred workers.	4	7	10	15	13	15
Managers and administrators, except farm.....	1	1	1	4	4	4
Sales, clerical, and kindred workers.....	1	9	21	33	41	42
Blue-collar workers.....	7	14	17	22	18	16
Craft and kindred workers.....	-	1	1	1	1	2
Operatives, including transport.....	6	12	14	20	15	13
Laborers, except farm.....	1	1	1	1	1	1
Farm workers.....	16	3	1	2	1	1
Farmers and farm managers.....	3	1	-	1	1	1
Farm laborers and supervisors.....	13	3	1	1	1	-
Service workers.....	70	57	38	22	17	16
Private household workers.....	60	36	15	11	4	2
Other service workers.....	10	21	23	11	13	14
Occupation not reported.....	1	8	12	1	5	8

- Rounds to zero.

NOTE: Occupation and industry statistics for the census years 1940, 1960, and 1970 are not strictly comparable. However, adjustments have been made in the 1960 data to achieve as close comparability with the 1970 classification systems as possible. Since these adjustments sometimes involved estimates, the reader should exercise caution in interpreting small changes between the two censuses. In the figures for persons 14 years old and over, the "not reported" cases for 1970 are treated according to the 1960 presentation; that is, the cases allocated to major groups in 1970 are removed from those groups and combined into a separate "not reported" category.

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census.

TABLE TWO

PERCENTAGE OF WOMEN IN TYPICALLY FEMALE* JOBS
BY RACE AND AGE FOR SELECTED YEARS

	1968	1977	1981	% reduction 68-81	Age grp chg 68-77
WHITE WOMEN	77.7	74.7	72.4	6.8%	
White collar	52.1	50.5	50.7	0.8%	
Blue collar	25.6	24.2	21.7	15.2%	
16-17			86.9		
White collar			40.7		
Blue collar			46.2		
18-19			84.0		
White collar			52.0		
Blue collar			32.0		
20-24			72.8		
White collar			53.9		
Blue collar			21.8		
25-34	78.2	73.7	69.8	10.7%	
White collar	56.5	54.4	52.2	7.6%	
Blue collar	21.7	19.3	17.6	18.9%	
35-44	73.8	72.9	68.7	6.9%	6.8%
White collar	50.7	52.1	50.7	0%	
Blue collar	23.8	20.8	18.0	24.4%	
45-54	73.8	71.2	70.1	5.0%	3.5%
White collar	48.0	50.1	49.7	3.5%	
Blue collar	25.8	21.1	20.4	20.9%	
55-64		72.8	71.1		1.4%
White collar		46.9	47.7		
Blue collar		25.9	23.4		
BLACK WOMEN	81.7	77.4	77.4	5.3%	
White collar	27.0	34.5	41.0	-51.9%	
Blue collar	54.7	42.9	36.4	33.4%	
16-17			85.1		
White collar			45.81		
Blue collar			39.3		
18-19			82.0		
White collar			52.7		
Blue collar			29.3		

TABLE TWO -- CONTINUED

20-24			75.1		
White collar			50.5		
Blue collar			24.6		
25-34	79.0	77.4	74.6	5.6%	
White collar	33.1	47.1	59.1	-78.5%	3.5%
Blue collar	45.9	30.3	25.5	44.4%	
35-44	78.8	76.2	74.7	5.2%	
White collar	23.0	33.4	39.4	-79.3%	-.1%
Blue collar	55.8	42.3	35.5	28.1%	
45-54	81.9	78.9	77.7	5.1%	
White collar	17.4	26.8	31.2	-79.3%	-1.5%*
Blue collar	64.5	51.1	46.4	28.1%	
55-64		83.1	80.2		
White collar		17.3	22.9		
Blue collar		65.8	57.3		

Source: Unpublished data, Bureau of Labor Statistics, 1981 from Current Population Surveys, annual averages

*** these women became MORE stratified as they aged

* Typically female job are defined in the text as other health professionals, noncollege teachers, retail sales workers, clericial workers, nondurable goods manufacturers, private household workers, and service workers except protective service workers. "White collar" typically female jobs are health professionals, noncollege teachers, retail sales workers and clerical workers. The remainder are blue "typically female" job.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE THREE
OCCUPATIONAL DISTRIBUTION
OF BLACK WOMEN
SELECTED YEARS

	1981	1977
PROFESSIONAL, TECHNICAL KINDRED WORKERS	15.4	13.3
ENGINEERS	0.1	0.1
PHYSICANS, DENTISTS	0.4	0.1
OTHER HEALTH PROF'S	4.4	1.7
NONCOLLEGE TEACHERS	4.7	4.7
ENGINEERING, SCIENCE TECHNICIANS	0.5	0.3
OTHER SALARIED	5.1	4.3
OTHER SELF-EMPLOYED	0.2	0.1
MANAGERIAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE, EXC FARM	4.1	2.7
SALARIED MANUFACTUR.	0.2	0.1
SALARIED OTH INDUSTRY	3.3	2.0
SELF-EMPLOYED, RETAIL	0.4	0.4
SELF-EMPLOYED, OTHER	0.2	0.4
SALES	3.2	2.7
RETAIL	2.4	2.3
OTHER	0.7	0.5
CLERICAL	29.5	25.8
BOOKKEEPER	1.9	1.3
OFFICE MACHINE OPS	2.2	1.9
SECRETARIES	8.2	7.1
OTHER CLERICAL	17.3	15.5
CRAFT AND KINDRED	1.5	1.4
CARPENTER	*	*
OTHER CONSTRUCTION	0.1	0.1
FOREMEN	0.4	0.3
MACHINE JOBSETTERS	0.1	0.1
OTHER METTAL WKRS	0.1	0.1
AUTO MECHANICS	*	*
OTHER MECHANICS	0.1	0.1
OTHER CRAFT	0.7	0.5
OPERATIVES, EXC. TRANS.	14.2	16.2
MINE WKRS	*	*
MOTOR VEHICLE EQUI	0.4	0.5
OTHER DURABLE MFG.	4.1	4.7
NON DURABLE MFG	7.2	8.2
OTHER OPERATIVES	2.5	2.8

TABLE THREE
OCCUPATIONAL DISTRIBUTION
BLACK WOMEN
CONTINUED

	1981	1977
TRANSPORT EQUIPMENT OPS	0.7	0.4
DRIVER DELIVERERS	0.6	0.4
ALL OTHERS	0.1	*
NONFARM LABORERS	1.3	1.3
CONSTRUCTION	*	0.1
MANUFACTURING	0.5	0.5
ALL OTHER	0.8	0.7
PRIVATE HOUSEHOLD WKRS.	6.0	8.4
SERVICE EX P.H.	23.7	26.7
CLEANING	5.6	6.4
FOOD	6.0	8.4
HEALTH	7.5	7.6
PERSONAL	3.3	3.7
PROTECTIVE	0.5	0.4
FARMERS AND FARM MGRS	0.1	*
FARM LABORERS/FOREMEN	0.5	1.0
PD	0.4	0.8
UNPD FAM	*	0.2

- LESS THAN 0.05%
SOURCE: UNPUBLISHED DATA, BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE FOUR

Occupational Distribution of Black Women
by Age, 1981

	ALL	16-17	18-19	20-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65
PROFESSIONAL, TECHNICAL, K.	15.4%	3.2%	2.7%	9.9%	19.4%	18.4%	16.0%	11.5%	7.5
Engineers	0.1	xx	xx	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.1	xx	xx
Physicians	0.4	xx	xx	xx	0.6	0.6	0.5	0.2	xx
Other Health	4.4	xx	0.5	2.7	5.3	6.0	4.5	3.2	1.7
Teachers, exc. College	4.7	1.1	xx	1.9	5.2	5.7	6.1	4.7	4.2
Eng. Sci. Technicians	0.5	xx	0.5	0.8	0.7	0.4	0.2	0.2	xx
Other, Salaried	5.1	1.1	1.5	4.2	7.3	5.4	4.3	3.2	1.7
Other Self-Employed	0.2	xx	xx	0.1	0.1	0.3	0.3	xx	xx
MANAGERS AND ADMINISTRATORS	4.1	xx	1.6	3.0	4.1	4.9	4.5	4.9	4.2
Salaried Mfg.	0.2	xx	xx	0.3	0.2	0.6	0.1	0.4	xx
Other Salaried	3.3	xx	1.6	2.7	0.4	3.9	3.4	3.0	1.6
Retail Self-Employed	0.4	xx	xx	0.1	0.1	0.4	0.6	1.2	2.5
Other, Self Employed	0.2	xx	xx	xx	0.1	0.3	0.3	0.4	0.8
SALES	3.2	7.4	8.7	4.7	3.0	2.2	2.5	2.4	1.6
Retail	2.4	6.4	8.7	3.4	1.9	1.9	2.1	2.0	1.6
Other	0.7	2.1	0.5	1.2	1.1	0.3	0.3	0.4	xx
CLERICAL WORKERS	29.5	38.3	43.5	42.5	36.7	25.9	18.5	13.0	7.5
Bookkeepers	1.9	xx	1.1	2.0	2.8	1.5	1.3	1.2	0.8
Office Machine Ops.	2.2	1.1	2.7	3.4	3.4	1.7	1.2	0.2	xx
Secretaries	.2	8.5	13.0	14.5	10.5	6.5	3.8	2.6	0.8
Other Clerical	17.3	29.8	26.6	22.6	19.9	16.1	11.6	9.3	5.8
CRAFT AND KINDRED	1.5	1.1	1.1	1.2	1.5	2.1	1.4	1.0	0.8
Carpenters	xx	1.1	xx	xx	xx	xx	xx	xx	xx
Other Construction	0.1	xx	xx	0.1	0.1	xx	xx	xx	xx
Foremen	0.4	xx	xx	0.1	0.4	0.7	0.5	0.4	xx
Machine Jobsetters	0.1	xx	xx	0.1	0.1	xx	0.1	xx	xx
Other Metal	0.1	xx	xx	xx	0.1	0.2	xx	xx	xx
Auto Mechanics	xx	xx	xx	xx	xx	xx	xx	xx	xx
Other Mechanics	0.1	xx	xx	0.1	0.1	0.2	xx	xx	xx
Other Craft	0.7	xx	0.5	0.7	0.7	1.1	0.6	0.4	0.3
OPERATIVES, EXC. TRANS	14.2	2.1	10.3	14.5	14.3	16.1	15.7	12.1	5.0
Mine	xx	xx	xx	xx	xx	xx	xx	xx	xx
Motor Vehicle	0.4	xx	0.5	0.1	0.7	0.2	0.3	0.2	0.8
Other Durable	4.1	1.1	2.2	4.2	4.5	5.0	4.1	2.8	2.5
Nondurable	7.2	1.1	6.0	7.8	7.5	8.2	7.6	4.7	1.6
Other Operatives	2.5	xx	1.5	2.2	1.6	2.4	3.7	4.4	xx
TRANSPORT EQUIP OPERATIVES	0.7	xx	xx	0.5	0.9	1.0	0.2	0.6	xx
Drivers and Deliverers	0.6	xx	xx	0.4	0.8	0.9	0.2	0.4	xx
Other	0.1	xx	xx	0.1	0.1	0.1	xx	xx	xx

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE FOUR -- continued

	ALL	16-17	18-19	20-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+
NONFARM LABORERS	1.3%	3.2%	1.1%	1.5%	1.1%	1.5%	1.2%	1.2%	0.8%
Construction	xx	xx	xx	0.1	xx	xx	xx	xx	xx
Manufacturing	0.5	xx	0.5	0.5	0.4	0.7	0.6	0.4	xx
Other	0.8	3.2	0.5	0.8	0.7	0.7	0.6	0.8	0.8
PRIVATE HOUSEHOLD	6.0	7.4	1.6	1.1	1.5	3.5	9.3	20.6	40.8
SERVICE, EXC. PRI. HOUS.	23.7	34.0	28.3	20.8	17.2	23.9	30.0	32.4	28.3
Cleaning	5.6	3.2	2.7	3.8	2.9	6.5	8.0	11.3	7.5
Food	6.8	22.3	16.3	6.9	4.5	5.9	8.2	7.5	7.5
Health	7.5	2.1	5.4	6.6	7.1	7.9	9.1	8.9	3.3
Personal	3.3	6.4	3.8	2.8	2.0	3.2	4.2	4.3	9.2
Protective	0.5	xx	xx	0.7	0.7	0.3	0.3	0.4	xx
FARMERS AND FARM MANAGERS	0.1	xx	xx	xx	xx	xx	0.1	0.2	0.8
FARM LABORERS AND FOREMEN	0.5	1.1	0.5	0.3	0.1	0.5	0.6	0.4	0.8
Paid	0.4	1.1	0.5	0.3	0.1	0.4	0.6	0.4	0.8
Unpaid Family	xx	xx	xx	xx	xx	0.1	xx	xx	xx
Estimated Population (in thousands)	5309	94	184	739	1632	1171	864	506	120

XX- less than .05%

Source: Unpublished data, Bureau of Labor Statistics, 1981 from Current Population Survey, annual averages

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE FIVE
OCCUPATIONAL DISTRIBUTION
OF HISPANIC WOMEN
SELECTED YEARS

	1981	1977
PROFESSIONAL, TECHNICAL AND KINDRED WORKERS	8.8	7.4
ENGINEERS	0.1	*
PHYSICANS, DENTISTS	0.2	0.1
OTHER HEALTH PROF'S	2.1	1.6
NONCOLLEGE TEACHERS	2.6	2.6
ENGINEERING, SCIENCE TECHNICIANS	0.5	.2
OTHER SALARIED	3.2	2.8
OTHER SELF-EMPLOYED	0.2	0.1
MANAGERIAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE, EXC FARM	4.8	3.0
SALARIED MANUFACTUR.	0.4	0.2
SALARIED OTH INDUSTRY	3.5	2.1
SELF-EMPLOYED, RETAIL	0.5	0.6
SELF-EMPLOYED, OTHER	0.4	0.2
SALES	5.1	4.5
RETAIL	3.8	3.9
OTHER	1.2	0.7
CLERICAL	31.9	29.2
BOOKKEEPER	2.5	2.0
OFFICE MACHINE OPS	1.7	1.6
SECRETARIES	9.4	9.5
OTHER CLERICAL	18.3	16.1
CRAFT AND KINDRED	2.4	2.0
CARPENTER	0.1	*
OTHER CONSTRUCTION	0.2	*
FOREMEN	0.8	0.7
MACHINE JOBSETTERS	0.1	0.1
OTHER METTAL WKRS	*	0.1
AUTO MECHANICS	0.1	*
OTHER MECHANICS	0.2	0.1
OTHER CRAFT	1.1	0.8
OPERATIVES, EXC. TRANS.	22.2	25.5
MINE WKRS	*	*
MOTOR VEHICLE EQUI	0.2	0.2
OTHER DURABLE MFG.	7.6	7.3
NON DURABLE MFG	11.1	14.1
OTHER OPERATIVES	3.3	3.4

TABLE FIVE
OCCUPATIONAL DISTRIBUTION
BLACK WOMEN
CONTINUED

	1981	1977
TRANSPORT EQUIPMENT OPS	0.4	0.4
DRIVER DELIVERERS	0.3	0.3
ALL OTHERS	0.1	0.1
FARM LABORERS	1.6	1.3
CONSTRUCTION	0.1	*
MANUFACTURING	0.6	0.5
ALL OTHER	1.0	0.8
PRIVATE HOUSEHOLD WKRS.	3.7	4.6
SERVICE EX P.H.	17.8	19.0
CLEANING	4.5	4.3
FOOD	6.1	7.1
HEALTH	3.6	3.9
PERSONAL	3.3	3.6
PROTECTIVE	0.3	0.1
FARMERS AND FARM MGRS	0.1	0.1
FARM LABORERS/FOREMEN	1.6	2.3
PD	1.5	2.2
UNPD FAM	0.1	0.1

* LESS THAN 0.05%
SOURCE: UNPUBLISHED DATA, BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE SIX
OCCUPATIONAL DISTRIBUTION
OF WOMEN BY RACE
1981

	BLACK WOMEN	HISPANIC WOMEN	MEXICAN WOMEN	WHITE WOMEN
PROFESSIONAL, TECHNICAL AND KINDRED WORKERS	15.4	8.8	7.5	17.30
ENGINEERS	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.2
PHYSICANS, DENTISTS	0.4	0.2	0.1	0.3
OTHER HEALTH PROF'S	4.4	2.1	1.6	4.7
NONCOLLEGE TEACHERS	4.7	2.6	2.6	5.4
ENGINEERING, SCIENCE TECHNICIANS	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5
OTHER SALARIED	5.1	3.2	2.6	5.8
OTHER SELF-EMPLOYED	.2	0.2	0.1	0.5
MANAGERIAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE, EXC FARM	4.1	4.8	3.9	7.8
SALARIED MANUFACTUR.	0.2	0.4	0.2	.6
SALARIED OTH INDUSTRY	3.3	3.5	3.1	6.0
SELF-EMPLOYED, RETAIL	0.4	0.5	0.3	0.8
SELF-EMPLOYED, OTHER	0.2	0.4	0.3	0.5
SALES	3.2	5.1	5.0	7.3
RETAIL	2.5	3.8	3.9	5.2
OTHER	0.8	1.2	1.1	2.1
CLERICAL	29.5	31.9	31.3	35.5
BOOKKEEPER	1.9	2.5	2.3	4.5
OFFICE MACHINE OPS	2.2	1.7	1.6	1.6
SECRETARIES	8.2	9.4	8.7	12.0
OTHER CLERICAL	17.3	18.3	18.6	17.5
CRAFT AND KINDRED	1.5	2.4	2.4	1.9
CARPENTER	*	0.1	0.1	0.1
OTHER CONSTRUCTION	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.1
FOREMEN	0.4	0.8	0.6	0.5
MACHINE JOBSETTERS	0.9	0.1	0.2	0.1
OTHER METTAL WKRS	0.8	*	*	0.1
AUTO MECHANICS	*	0.1	*	*
OTHER MECHANICS	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.1
OTHER CRAFT	*	1.1	1.2	1.0
OPERATIVES, EXC. TRANS.	14.2	22.2	22.6	9.1
MINE WKRS	*	*	*	*
MOTOR VEHICLE EQUI	*	0.2	0.2	.2
OTHER DURABLE MFG.	4.1	7.6	7.9	3.4
NON DURABLE MFG	7.2	11.1	10.5	4.1
OTHER OPERATIVES	2.5	3.3	4.1	1.4
TRANSPORT EQUIPMENT OPS	0.7	0.4	0.5	0.7
DRIVER DELIVERERS	0.6	0.3	0.4	0.7
ALL OTHERS	0.8	0.1	0.2	0.1

TABLE SIX
OCCUPATIONAL DISTRIBUTION
RACE-SEX GROUP
CONTINUED

	BLACK WOMEN	HISPANIC WOMEN	MEXICAN WOMEN	WHITE WOMEN
FARM LABORERS	1.3	1.6	2.3	1.2
CONSTRUCTION	*	0.1	0.2	*
MANUFACTURING	0.5	0.6	0.9	0.3
ALL OTHER	0.8	1.0	1.3	0.9
PRIVATE HOUSEHOLD WKRS.	9.7	3.7	2.8	1.8
SERVICE EX P.H.	23.7	17.8	18.2	16.1
CLEANING	5.6	4.5	5.0	1.8
FOOD	6.8	6.1	6.8	7.3
HEALTH	7.4	3.6	3.3	3.7
PERSONAL	3.3	3.3	3.0	3.1
PROTECTIVE	0.5	0.3	0.2	0.3
FARMERS AND FARM MGRS	0.1	0.1	*	0.5
FARM LABORERS/FOREMEN	0.5	1.6	1.1	0.8
PD	0.4	1.5	1.1	0.4
UNPD FAM	*	0.1	*	0.4

THIS TABLE SHOWS THE PERCENTAGE OF WORKERS IN EACH RACIAL-ETHNIC GROUP
OCCUPATION: TOTALS SHOULD ADD TO 100
LESS THAN 0.05%
SOURCE: UNPUBLISHED DATA, BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE SEVEN
SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS
OF MAJOR OCCUAPATIONS
1983

OCCUPATION	%UNEM	%PART TIME	%PART TIME ECON	MEDIAN MALE PAY	MEDIAN FEMALE PAY
TOTAL	9.2	18.1	7.2		
MANAGERIAL, PROFESSIONAL	3.4	10.4	2.5	534	352
EXECUTIVE, ADMIN,MGR'L	2.9	6.3	1.6	552	334
PROFESSIONAL SPECIALTY	3.9	14.8	3.5	517	366
TECHNICAL,SALES, SUPPORT	6.4	20.3	5.9	394	246
TECHNICAL	5.2	11.1	2.2	418	301
SALES (1)	6.6	26.8	8.7	397	209
CLERICAL/SUPPORT STAFF (2)	6.4	17.1	4.2	375	247
SERVICE OCCUPATIONS (3)	10.3	37.3	16.1	259	181
PRIVATE HOUSEHOLD	8.2	66.2	25.3	*	115
PROTECTIVE SERVICE	5.7	11.4	4.6	358	251
OTHER SERVICE	11.1	38.7	17.0	223	182
CRAFT AND PRECISION PRODUCTION	9.3	8.9	6.2	392	263
OPERATORS, LABORERS	13.8	14.3	8.8	314	212
MACHINE OPERATORS (4)	14.2	10.1	6.7	322	210
TRANSPORT OPERATIVES	10.0	10.5	7.1	345	252
HANDLERS, HELPERS, LABORERS	16.5	24.9	14.0	251	219

SOURCE: EMPLOYMENT AND EARNINGS, SEPTEMBER, 1983
NOTES * INSIGNIFICANT NUMBER OF WORKERS
(1) IDENTICAL TO 1981 SALES CATEGORY
(2) IDENTICAL TO 1981 CLERICAL CATEGORY
(3) EXCEPT FOR THE ADDITION OF PRIVATE HOUSEHOLD WORKERS, IDENTICAL TO THE 1981 SERVICE CATEGORY
(4) THIS CATEGORY INCLUDES ASSMEBLERS

TABLE EIGHT

PART TIME STATUS OF WOMEN
BY OCCUPATION
1983

	PERCENT PT ECON.	PERCENT VOL P.T.	DIST ECON PART TIME	DIST VOL. PART TIME
TOTAL	9.15	18.45		
OCCUPATION				
L	3.41	15.19	6.81	15.07
EXEC, ADMINISTRATIVE	1.70	9.22	1.58	4.24
PROF'L SPECIALTY	4.87	20.33	5.23	10.84
TECH, SALES, SUPPORT	7.16	18.94	38.12	50.06
TECH	2.57	14.06	0.99	2.70
SALES	14.27	29.89	22.13	23.01
CLERICAL/ADMIN SUPPORT	4.42	14.49	14.97	24.35
SERVICE OCCUPATIONS	18.83	26.47	41.92	29.24
PRIVATE HOUSEHOLD	25.17	41.28	6.66	5.43
PROTECTIVE	12.80	18.96	0.79	0.58
OTHER SERVICE	18.14	24.65	34.46	23.24
CRAFT PRECISION PROD.	6.12	9.88	1.67	1.33
OPERATORS, LABORERS	10.47	7.89	11.52	4.31
MACHINE OPERATORS	9.55	5.39	8.18	2.29
TRANS /MVG OPERATORS	10.17	15.82	0.53	0.41
HANDLERS	14.68	16.97	2.81	1.61

SOURCE: EMPLOYMENT AND EARNINGS
SEPTEMBER, 1983

TABLE NINE

PERCENT WOMEN IN SERVICE OCCUPATIONS
1981

	% WHITE WOMEN	% BLACK WOMEN	NUMBER BLACK WOMEN	MEDIAN WOMEN'S PAY
TOTAL LABOR FORCE	37.5	5.4	5309	224
SERVICE WORKERS	48.9	10.4	1257	170
CHAMBERMAIDS	60.0	36.6	64	141
WELFARE SVC AIDS	60.5	27.9	24	182
NURSING AIDS	62.8	23.8	266	167
PRACTICAL NURSES	79.2	18.5	173	227
BOARDING KEEPERS	72.7	18.2	2	235
CLEANERS	38.5	17.0	159	168
HEALTH AIDS	67.8	16.4	50	201
OTHER HEALTH SVC	57.8	15.6	84	160
SCHOOL MONITORS	83.3	13.9	5	167
CHILD CARE WKRS	82.7	13.4	56	145
ELEVATOR OPS	6.3	12.5	2	260
HEALTH TRAINEES	62.5	12.5	1	252
PERS SVC ATDS	46.4	11.3	11	211
FOOD COUNTER WKR	72.8	10.7	49	149
HOUSEKEEPERS	59.4	10.5	14	205
COOKS	42.4	9.9	135	148
CRSG GUARDS	53.3	8.9	4	183
HAIRDRESSERS	80.9	8.7	49	172
AIRLINE STEWS	79.1	7.0	3	396
USHERS	29.4	5.9	1	147
DENTAL ASSIST'S	92.1	5.8	8	182
JANITORS	13.6	5.4	72	188
WAITERS	84.6	5.1	73	144
DISHWASHERS	24.5	4.0	10	132
BARBERS	13.2	3.8	4	209
BUSBOYS	16.1	3.2	7	138
GUARDS/WATCHERS	10.6	3.1	18	214
RECREATION ATDS	44.4	1.7	3	173
BARTENDERS	46.0	1.3	4	179
POLICE/DETECTIVE	4.6	1.0	5	255
LAY MIDWIVES	100	*	0	424
BAGGAGE HANDLERS	*	*	0	174
BOOTBLACKS	*	*	0	0
FIREMEN	0.9	*	0	311
MARSHALLS	*	*	0	0
SHERIFF	7.2	*	0	308

TABLE TEN
PERCENT OF WOMEN CLERICALS
1981

	% WHITE WOMEN	% BLACK WOMEN	NUMBER BLACK WOMEN	MEDIAN WOMEN'S PAY
TOTAL LABOR FORCE	37.4	5.4	5309	224
CLERICAL WORKERS	71.9	8.6	1568	219
CALC MACHINE OPS	61.1	27.8	5	192
SOC WK CLER ASS'TS	64.4	20.0	9	262
KEYPUNCH OPS	76.1	18.1	44	222
FILE CLERKS	65.5	17.9	55	189
TEACHER AIDS	76.4	16.6	62	166
TYPISTS	80.0	16.3	165	211
TELEPHONE OPERATOR	77.4	15.6	47	239
MISC OFC MACH OPS	55.8	15.0	9	186
ENUMERATORS	63.2	14.1	8	201
POSTAL CLERKS	24.0	13.7	36	382
STATISTICAL CLERKS	67.6	12.7	46	227
BILL MACH OPS	76.6	12.7	6	194
LIBRARY ATTENDANTS	71.8	10.7	16	197
MISC CLERICAL WKRS	71.4	10.6	132	222
NOT SPEC CLERICAL	68.7	10.3	46	217
STENOGRAPERS	76.4	9.7	7	260
CASHIERS	76.9	9.4	153	133
COMPUTER OPERATORS	54.4	9.4	52	232
CLERICAL SUP'VISOR	61.8	8.9	22	291
DUP. MACH OPERATOR	52.2	8.7	2	235
COURTER CLERKS	68.5	8.0	28	195
BILLING CLERKS	80.1	7.9	12	209
PROOFREADERS	73.7	7.9	3	251
RECEPTIONISTS	89.5	7.9	52	199
COLLECTORS	56.7	7.8	7	215
ESTIMATORS	46.9	7.6	40	256
MAIL HANDLERS	40.1	7.6	13	202
PAYROLL CLERKS	73.9	7.1	16	237
INSURANCE ADJUSTER	51.1	7.0	13	230
SECRETARIES, GEN	92.2	6.9	247	228
BANK TELLERS	87.3	6.5	36	188
MEDICAL SEC'S	93.8	6.2	5	218
DISPATCHERS	32.7	5.3	6	256
WEIGHERS	31.6	5.3	2	196
STOCK CLERKS	29.8	5.2	27	217
BOOKKEEPERS	86.0	5.2	99	222
LEGAL SEC'S	93.9	5.0	9	260
TICKET AGENTS	43.1	4.2	6	370
EXPEDITERS	38.2	3.2	8	275
MESSENGERS	23.4	3.2	3	210
REAL ESTATE APPR.	13.2	2.6	1	307
SHIPPING CLERKS	20.6	2.1	11	205
MAIL CARRIERS	13.4	1.7	4	373
TEL'G OPERATORS	50.0	*	0	144
TEL MESSENGERS	50.0	*	0	224
METER READERS	11.3	*	0	238

TABLE ELEVEN

WORKING WOMEN IN POVERTY *
BY MAJOR OCCUPATION, 1981
(NUMBERS IN THOUSANDS)

	BLACK WOMEN		WHITE WOMEN		HISPANIC WOMEN	
OCCUPATION	POOR	NEAR-POOR	POOR	NEAR-POOR	POOR	N-POOR
SERVICE	965	285	4755	792	279	52
PRIVATE HSHLD	317	0	671	0	73	0
OPERATIVE	253	481	921	2232	149	284
CLERICAL	215	628	1534	4548	80	233
SALES	117	5	1580	96	65	3
LABORERS	5	54	79	325	3	24
TRANSPORT OPS.	0	6	0	57	0	8
					649	604
PERCENT TOTAL MEN	35.6	26	26	21.9	32.4	30.2
TOTAL POOR NEAR-POOR	61.6		47.9		62.6	

*POVERTY STATUS IS DETERMINED BY USING MEDIAN WEEKLY FULL TIME EARNINGS OF WORKERS, AT THE DETAILED OCC. LEVEL. AS NOTED IN THE TEXT, THESE NUMBERS ARE ESTIMATES, AS SOME WOMEN WORK LESS THAN FULL-TIME, AND BECAUSE SOME WOMEN EARN MORE THAN MEDIAN OCCUPATIONAL EARNINGS

SINCE DETAILED DATA IS UNAVAILABLE FOR HISPANICS, ESTIMATES OF POOR AND NEAR POOR STATUS IS MADE BASED ON THE PROPORTION OF WHITE AND BLACK POOR AND NEAR POOR WOMEN.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

NOTES

Most of the data presented in this paper come from unpublished reports of the Bureau of Labor Statistics on the detailed occupational status of black women, on pay levels for men and women by detailed occupation, and on unemployment and labor force participaton rates. There may be concern that some of the age-race-occupation cells are not statistically significant. For further discussion of this see Julianne Malveaux "Recent Trends in Occupational Segregation by Race and Sex"; unpublished paper, 1982.

Data on poverty status is usually directly referenced, especially by table. When this is not done, recent publications of the US Department of Commerce have be consulted. These include "Money Income of Households, Families, and Persons in the United States: 1981" (Series P-60, No. 137) and "Money Income and Poverty Status of Families and Persons in the United States: 1982" (Series P-60, No. 140)

Department of Labor, EMPLOYMENT AND EARNINGS, 1983 issues. Vol 30, Issues 1-12.

Constance Dicesare, "Changes in the Occupational Structure of U.S. Jobs," MONTHLY LABOR REVIEW. March, 1975

Guadalupe Friaz, "Segmented Markets in Silicon Valley High Tech Firms: Implications for Production Workers". Paper presented at URPE Meetings, December, 1983

Jacqueline Jackson, "Vulnerabilites and strengths of old women: the effects of living long, poverty, and minority status," in Haug, M. VULNERABILITIES AND STRENGTHS OF OLDER WOMEN. New York: Springer, 1983

Carol Jusenius "The Influence of Work Experience and Tyupicality of Occupational Assignment on Women's Earnings" in DUAL CAREERS. Manpower Research Monograph No. 21, Vol. 4 (US Department of Labor, 1976)

N.R. Kleinfield, "Chain Store Health Care" in THIS WORLD, SAN FRANCISCO CHRONICLE. September 18, 1983

Julianne Malveaux. BLACK WOMEN IN THE AMERICAN ECONOMY: HISTORICAL BACKGROUND TO RECENT TRENDS. Prepared for the National Council of Negro Women, November, 1981

Julianne Malveaux, "Powerless by Definition: Occupational and Pay Patterns of Women in the Workplace". Association for the Advancement of Science, January, 1982

Julianne Malveaux, "Low Wage Black Women: Occupational Descriptions, Strategies for Change", NAACP Legal Defense and Education Fund, 1984

Alfredo Mirande and Evangelina Enriques, LA CHICANA: THE MEXICAN AMERICAN WOMAN. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979.